
Lake Oroville SRA General Plan Issues

Public Scoping Meeting

April 14, 2004

Municipal Auditorium, Oroville

Transcribed notes from spoken comments provided at Public Scoping Meeting

General Issues:

- Community wants opportunity to provide input during second tier projects and environmental reviews.
- DPR should include/consider what the public wanted 30 years ago in the previous plan.
- More local (city) input is needed in agency coordination efforts
 - Review city and council plans
- What is DPR policy for balancing between recreation and resource protection?
- DRP needs to consider information from several sources not just DWR studies
- Some DWR studies are flawed and do not reflect comments/input made at ORAC meetings.
 - Planning team should review minutes of ORAC meetings to understand public user concerns.
 - DPR/planning team rep. should attend ORAC meeting to receive input and understand concerns.

Environmental Issues:

- Replace vegetation with native plants
- No introduction of non-native fish species
- Wetlands habitat created from leaky pipes, etc. should be preserved for protection of wetland species
- Coordination with other management authorities to improve management

- Need to determine appropriate actions for management/eradication of non-native wildlife

Land Use & Aesthetics:

- Work with the Butte County Fire Safe Council
- Management of driftwood on shore which impacts boaters and others
 - How & when it is removed
 - Used for fuel by local residents
- Concern with loss of trees around shoreline at low water levels
 - Plant water-tolerant species
- Need a debris management plan
- Manage lands for low impact recreation- goal of 1973 plan
 - Low density use of diversion pool area
 - We have moved away from this concept that preserves natural and aesthetic resources

Cultural Issues:

- Concern about the permits for Native American plant-material gathering in SRA and other areas
 - Why are permits required?
 - How are these enforced?
 - Does not apply equally to everyone
 - Specific plants are part of Native American culture- possible conflict with federal protection
- Cultural impacts are not limited to only Native Americans
 - Consider ranching history and other cultural histories
 - Interpretive themes should address ranching
 - Protect burial grounds
 - Provide mitigations for impacts to all

Recreation Issues (General):

- Cold water impact on people
 - Improve water flows for fishing and boating
- Dam construction impacts on area recreation:
 - Entrance to park facilities limits some use
 - Access is limited for low income users

- Fewer swimming areas
- Loss of river-oriented activities
- Reduce fees / low cost opportunities desired
 - More facilities lead to increased operation cost
 - Funding comes from several sources
- Want day-use access to boat-in campgrounds
- Need more shoreline and trail access for people with disabilities
 - Provide transportation
 - Consider appropriate trail surfaces
- Recreational hunting is an appropriate management tool for wildlife
- Where is hunting allowed?
 - Restricted areas
 - Accurate information is essential
- Community economic interests rely directly on state management of SRA
 - Bring tourism to area
 - Loafer Creek facilities are not complete or accessible
 - Make facilities more complete with amenities people want and need
 - Look for public/private partnerships
 - commercial developments
 - opportunities for private development

Recreation Issues (Trails and Equestrian):

- Need more miles of foot paths (no mountain bikes or patrol vehicles)
 - Single track (for hikers)
 - Narrow width – can include equestrians
- Bring back nature trails with some obstacles, vegetation encroachment improves trail experience with aesthetic values
- Stop DRP trail maintenance practices – no mechanical trail grading
- Impacts from trail construction and maintenance
 - Erosion
 - Cutting of trees
 - Need more sensitivity to natural resources
 - Mechanical trail blazer used for cutting trails is not environmentally friendly
 - Trails maintenance has caused erosion and dusty conditions
 - Equestrian trail maintenance was better

- Use trail groups for better maintenance practices.
 - More pre-planning is needed and measures to prevent impacts from machine grading
- Traditional hiking and equestrian trails should not be converted to multi-use trails for mountain bikes
 - Need separate trails
 - DWR studies do not accurately reflect current uses
 - Trail markers are not clear
 - Who's jurisdiction for reporting conflicts? Liability issues?
 - User conflicts present safety hazards.
- Open up day use areas (trails) with minimal facilities
 - For equestrian use
 - Get word out about opportunities
 - Economic impact and benefits
- Equestrian groups and activities can benefit/contribute to economic benefit.
- Justification for fee structure (for equestrian facilities)
- Opportunity for diverse recreation
 - Avoid multi-use trails for all areas
 - Multi-use trails okay for some areas
 - Separate trail opportunity for non-bike uses
- SRA is unique place with opportunities for a different approach to multi-use trails
- Look for alternative pavement treatments

Education and Interpretation Issues:

- New Visitor Center
 - New visitor center should be located near highway
 - Existing VC is difficult to get to
 - Old VC should be converted to education center
 - Desire representatives from DPR, CDFG, DWR, and local agencies
 - Want a one-stop information visitor center
 - High education value
- Education/demonstration opportunities
- Need a multi-cultural museum
 - Opportunity to bring back artifacts for education
- Locals can help improve interpretive signage

Written Comments provided by two attendees at Public Scoping Meeting (none received after meeting)

First Commenter:

1. General Plan should address as main issue: Access!
2. Develop Foreman Creek for day-use recreation and cultural uses
3. Provide daytime access to Foreman Creek boat-in campground. Improve road.

Second Commenter:

1. General Plan should address as main issue: Public desires. Continue cooperating with local Native Americans.
2. Improve safety of horse vs. bike use.
3. Plan should provide specific plans for recreation development and management for next 30 years
4. What trails will be built? How will they be managed?
5. Will there be hunting allowed?
6. Need to be specific, don't be afraid to plan (not "adaptive management")
7. Accept turkeys and pheasants as part of our culture
8. Let DWR do the recreation plan (period!)
9. Interpret and protect and refurbish mining and ranching cultural artifacts
10. Kill the Scotch broom and discourage star thistle
11. Better training for rangers—sensitivity included.
12. Get rid of the "trail-machine"
13. Follow NEPA and CEQA
14. No more categorical exemptions or piece-mealing
15. Whole plan needs scoping, not just Tier 1. No more fragmentation!
16. Retain the low density recreation approach in the Diversion Pool land areas
 - Avoid erosion
 - Preserve aesthetics
 - Protect "conservation area"
1. Preserve jurisdictional wetlands—even those from ditch leaks
2. More interpretation of mining and ranching cultures
3. Back off from doubling fees
4. Don't kill the golden egg laying goose
5. Partnership with private clubs etc. for education—advertise on DPR Website
 - Fishing clinics
 - Basket-weaving classes
 - Horse-endurance/riding training seminars
 - Gold panning hang gliding
 - Kayaking, etc.